

Marion County Public Schools

# North Marion Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## North Marion Middle School

2085 W HIGHWAY 329, Citra, FL 32113

[ no web address on file ]

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

North Marion Middle School will provide a quality academic program that prepares students to become responsible and successful in our global society.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Striving for academic excellence in student performance through empowering students to take ownership of their learning.

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

#### School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Johnson, James	Principal	The Principal is the instructional leader of the school. Their job duties include, but are not limited to accountability, public relations, budgets, evaluations, SAC, facilities, crisis management, Title 1, business partners, scheduling, and professional development.
Gamoneda, Sheila	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal of Curriculum's main role is to oversee the areas of curriculum and instruction. Some of their job duties and responsibilities include overseeing Guidance Department, Tier Talks/PMP meetings, PST meetings, MTSS, Skyward gradebook, report cards and progress reports, professional development, and evaluations.
Jones, Cynthia	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal of Instruction's main role is to oversee the areas of testing and assessment. Some of their job duties and responsibilities include testing coordinator, all instructional materials (textbooks and technology resources), Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT), professional development, and evaluations.
Fennewald, Brian	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal of Discipline oversees the areas of discipline and behavior, and oversees the following: fire and ALICE drills, school safety, Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS), behavior MTSS, Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT), and PST meetings for behavior.

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

During our final SAC meeting of the 22-23 school year, we sought out feedback from our members to assist in identifying our areas of concern and to also develop some potential instructional goals for this year. Once we got more relevant data sources back, our leadership team partnered with teacher leaders to finalize our goals for this year by examining how we can address the areas that will have the most impact to our students.

### SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP at NMMS will be reviewed periodically at leadership meetings throughout the year, to both monitor effectiveness and also so that the plan can be revised if needed. We will spend extra time reviewing the progress of our under-performing ESSA subgroups (Black, ESE, ESOL, Econ. Dis.) at all of these meetings to ensure that they are making adequate progress as well. The plan will also be reviewed at SAC meetings, to collect input from those stakeholders, so that we can get additional perspectives on goal progress. In addition to these progress monitoring meetings, we will also target these subgroups of students at our 6 yearly family engagement events that are scheduled throughout the year.

### Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	59%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C
	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

## Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	102	89	305	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	105	97	325	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	10	11	74	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	20	8	59	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	100	90	296	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	81	80	259	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	194	189	183	566	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:



Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	82	112	290	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	107	91	294	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	92	62	219	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	82	85	206	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	97	81	275	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	103	110	315	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	111	113	302

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	82	112	290	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	107	91	294	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	92	62	219	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	82	85	206	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	97	81	275	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	103	110	315	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	111	113	302

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review****ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	33			36	42	50	34		
ELA Learning Gains				40	41	48	41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33	31	38	31		
Math Achievement*	35			35	46	54	35		
Math Learning Gains				39	49	58	34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41	43	55	32		
Science Achievement*	31			30	40	49	27		
Social Studies Achievement*	47			52	65	71	44		
Middle School Acceleration	73			62			64		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	30			46			44		

\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	249
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

### ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	9	Yes	4	4
ELL	38	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	3	
HSP	44			
MUL	34	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	50			

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
FRL	38	Yes	2	

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	22	Yes	3	3
ELL	34	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	2	1
HSP	42			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	47			
FRL	37	Yes	1	

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

**2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	33			35			31	47	73			30
SWD	7			8			6	16			4	
ELL	36			31			18	50	64		6	30
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			19			15	33	83		5	
HSP	38			38			40	53	61		6	33
MUL	26			37				40			3	

## 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	38			44			40	56	74		5	
FRL	30			30			26	43	70		6	31

## 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	36	40	33	35	39	41	30	52	62			46
SWD	10	30	29	10	27	34	18	19				
ELL	34	34	15	35	33	15	18	44	62			46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19	33	30	19	34	40	12	34	48			
HSP	41	44	28	40	42	38	26	57	58			44
MUL	50	43		46	48							
PAC												
WHT	44	43	38	43	41	43	43	61	67			
FRL	30	37	34	28	36	40	25	42	52			48

## 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	34	41	31	35	34	32	27	44	64			44
SWD	7	26	27	7	23	31	3	12				
ELL	27	48	38	24	34	33	14	31				44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	16	28	25	17	22	25	9	21	35			
HSP	42	50	41	38	39	44	27	48	62			48
MUL	50	74		50	40							
PAC												
WHT	44	43	31	46	40	31	39	57	71			
FRL	27	36	28	27	31	30	20	38	55			39

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	32%	37%	-5%	47%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	28%	38%	-10%	47%	-19%
06	2023 - Spring	28%	36%	-8%	47%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	30%	44%	-14%	54%	-24%
07	2023 - Spring	23%	41%	-18%	48%	-25%
08	2023 - Spring	35%	45%	-10%	55%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	30%	37%	-7%	44%	-14%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	44%	38%	50%	32%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	43%	43%	48%	38%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	46%	58%	-12%	66%	-20%

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The data component that showed the lowest performance this year is ELA achievement. ELA has consistently finished with less than 40% of the students being proficient, but this year that number fell to 31%, which is 5% lower than the previous year. When brainstorming some potential root causes for the decline in ELA, teachers indicated their unfamiliarity with the new benchmarks and the new assessment ultimately contributed to some of the decline. We also determined that having 3 brand new ELA teachers, could have also contributed to the decline, and also a substitute covering a class for the entire school year.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

ELA achievement was also the area that declined the most from the previous year. As stated earlier, unfamiliarity with the new BEST standards and new staff members in ELA, were the major contributing factors to the decline.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Civics. The state had 66% of their students score proficient, but here at NMMS we were at 46%. A few of the factors that contributed to the gap include losing the previous year's Department Chairperson to another school and also having 2 brand new teachers in that subject area. The Department Chair that left was a veteran Civics teacher that assisted in planning lessons and developing assessments for the other teachers in the department.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

The area that showed the most improvement from last year is math achievement. One of the things that we did last year in the Math department was to improve the collaborative planning process. In addition to a more efficient collaborative planning process, we also provided our students with a specific Math remediation program for the students that were not proficient from the year before. Also, we added a supplemental curriculum program where teachers were able to prescribe specific lessons to individual students to help fill in gaps that the students had.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

When reflecting on the EWS data from last year, the stakeholders determined that the amount of time students were missing due to suspensions, was an area of concern. Attendance is also a large area of concern, but when looking at the data further it was determined that a good portion of these absences were a direct result of student disciplinary action.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.**

1. Improve tier 1 instruction in all areas - core classes and electives
2. Reduce the amount of instructional time lost due to student discipline events.

### **Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Proficiency in core subject areas has seen a sharp decline since 2019. Since 2019, ELA proficiency has dropped from 43% in 2019 to 31% in 2023, and in Math from 49% in 2019 to 38% in 2023. Civics continues to score below both the district and state level and Physical Science has also declined well below district and state levels. In addition, we also have four ESSA subgroups that are below 41% proficient. Those groups are Black students, Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged Students, and ESOL students. Because these deficiencies are across the board, and because of observations during administrative walkthroughs, it was determined that tier 1 instruction isn't at the level it needs to be to consistently get students to mastery in core subjects.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

If teachers plan collaboratively to develop quality/appropriate instructional tasks, and use the data generated from these tasks to guide future instruction, then proficiency in ELA will increase from 36% to 41% and Math will increase from 35% to 41%. If these practices are also replicated in Social Studies and Science, then Civics scores will increase from 47% to 52% and Physical Science will improve from 32% proficient to 37%. In addition to these measures, the four under-performing ESSA subgroups will increase by at least 5%.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results. During these data meetings, we will pay special attention to the students in our 4 under-performing ESSA subgroups. We will also monitor the effectiveness of implementation using classroom walkthrough observational data and other assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

James Johnson (james.johnson@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will be provided with professional development in instructional task selection and purposeful ongoing formative assessment. We will follow up on these professional learning opportunities by conducting focused formative walkthroughs with the leadership team to gauge the implementation of these practices. According to John Hattie's research, in his Index of Teaching, teacher use of formative evaluations has a .90 effect size and the highest effects are seen when teachers seek evidence on where exactly students aren't doing well.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through evidence collected in doing classroom walkthroughs, it was found that Tier 1 instruction is inconsistent among teachers at NMMS across subject areas. Therefore, in addition to continuing to improve our collaborative planning process, we are focusing on improving teachers' Tier 1 instruction across all subjects and grade levels. Specifically, we will focus on student engagement through discourse, providing students with quality feedback, and implementation of purposeful formative assessment to drive future instruction.

### **Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

### **Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### **Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Support teachers with Tier 1 goals during weekly collaborative planning meetings. During these meetings, coaches/administrators and teachers will work together to develop the pacing and sequencing of the standards taught each week. The teachers will be provided with a number of vetted, standards-aligned, resources to use to plan each week's learning activities. Coach and Administrators will also support the teachers in purposeful planning of embedded formative assessments to systematically monitor the entire classes' level of mastery of each lesson. This collected data will also be discussed and compared between teachers in like-classes each week at collaborative planning meetings to help guide future instruction. We will also look at our under-performing subgroup students specifically at these data meetings.

**Person Responsible:** Sheila Gamoneda (sheila.gamoneda@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Collaborative planning PLC groups should be up and running by the 2nd full week of school.

**#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to our EWS data from last school year, almost 300 students (approximately 40%) received at least 1 suspension during the 22-23 school year. This resulted in a significant increase in lost instructional time over previous years. Of those 300 students, over half were included in at least one of our four under performing subgroups (Black, SWD, ESOL, Econ. Disad.).

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

If teachers teach and maintain appropriate Tier 1 behavioral expectations in classes, then student behavioral incidents reported to the student management office will be reduced by 10%, resulting in a reduction in incidents and more student time in class.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This will be monitored through monthly data meetings within the leadership team to evaluate the number of referrals being processed, what the referrals are for, determine the trends, identify our under-performing subgroup students in the data, and put in place either interventions for the students, professional development focused on classroom management, or re-evaluate systems that are currently in place that need to be modified.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Brian Fennewald (brian.fennewald@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

To effectively increase the capacity of our staff when it comes to classroom management, North Marion Middle School will implement a PBIS program that will focus on increasing the staff and student awareness of each other and promote positive communication between the school and home.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Positive Behavior Interventions and Support program is research based and part of the 10 critical elements is to create positive relationships with students and the community as well as celebrate success. By utilizing the many different resources available through PBS and also by utilizing the PBS Committee to monitor student progress and action plan to determine next steps for groups and individual students, there will be a decrease in lost instructional time for students due to disciplinary actions.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will be provided professional learning in teaching Tier 1 behaviors in class along with classroom management techniques. We will follow up on these Professional Development opportunities by conducting focused formative walkthroughs with leadership team to gauge the implementation.

**Person Responsible:** Cynthia Jones (cynthia.jones@marion.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Professional learning to begin during teacher pre-week and continue periodically throughout the year at monthly early release trainings.

**CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Historically, we have used our title-1 budget at North Marion Middle to pay for personnel salaries. We currently pay for our Content Area Specialist, a critical math teacher, and three paraprofessionals with our title-1 funds. We try to strategically place these employees to work with our most at-risk students, including those students in our under-performing subgroups. These costs comprise over 90% of our yearly budget, with the remaining funds used to purchase planners and other items to support our family engagement initiatives.

**Title I Requirements****Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))**

List the school's webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Our SIP at NMMS is disseminated to stakeholders in a variety of ways. First of all, our school webpage is <https://www.marionschools.net/nms> has our School Improvement Plan and Parent and Family Engagement Plan posted at all times. We also review and discuss these documents at our School Advisory Council meetings as well. Furthermore, these documents are also available at our front office upon request in both English and Spanish.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.**

List the school's webpage\* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

At NMMS we will remind the families regularly where they can find both the School Improvement Plan and the Parent And Family engagement Plan on our school website <https://www.marionschools.net/nms> so that they are aware of our Parent Engagement events and some ways that they can support their student. We will also strive to keep an open line of communication between the school and home by sending home newsletters and skylerts to keep families up to date on all family engagement events, as well as opportunities to discuss their child's progress.

**Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))**

With our annual Title 1 budget, we have chosen to hire personnel to specifically support our bottom quartile of students as well as our under-performing subgroups. We are also hosting family nights that are going to provide students/families extra opportunities for acceleration and enrichment.

**If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))**

We will continue to advertise, promote, and participate in the large career day at our feeder high school. We will also be partnering with both a young men's and young women's mentorship group that help some of our at-risk students navigate through their teen years.